

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-22. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 12-22 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REQUEST FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW:

Applicants also respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, and prior to acting on the case, for discussion in order to expedite the prosecution of this application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §102:

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Shibao (European Publication No. 1 289 241 A1).

Shibao does not teach or suggest assigning "a specific call recipient to a specific reference number of a specific multimedia object", "sending a connection setup request... to the telecommunication network", "determining the corresponding reference number specified for the second telecommunication subscriber based on the assignment" and "transmitting, from the telecommunication network to the second telecommunication device, an identified multimedia object assigned to the corresponding reference number", as recited in claim 12.

Instead, Shibao transmits the bitmap frames as the calling party information to the called-end terminal station 5 where the calling party information reproducing unit 52 displays each bitmap frame sequentially to replay the animation" (see, paragraph 52).

It is respectfully submitted that Shibao does not disclose each and every element of the Applicants' claim 12 including "a specific call recipient to a specific reference number of a specific multimedia object", "determining the corresponding reference number specified for the second telecommunication subscriber based on the assignment" and "transmitting, from the telecommunication network to the second telecommunication device, an identified multimedia object assigned to the corresponding reference number." Therefore, since Shibao does not disclose the features recited in the independent claims, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims patentably distinguishes over Shibao, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims depending from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by Shibao. For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Shibao. The dependent claims are also independently patentable.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

WITHDRAWAL OF FINALITY:

As discussed above, each of the independent claims are allowable over Shibao, and therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the finality of the rejection and withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 5, 2009 By: /Temnit Afework/

Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

